

great aristocracy which has furnished leaders to the nation in peace and war for generations; even a democrat like myself must admit this. But there is absolutely nothing to be said for government by a plutocracy, for government by men very powerful in certain lines and gifted with the 'money touch,' but with ideals which in their essence are merely those of so many glorified pawnbrokers."

To Sir Henry Lucy, London, he wrote on December 18,

1912:

"As for my own political future, I think the general English estimate is right. I- hated to get into this fight at all, but I did not see how to avoid it; and having gone in, there was nothing to do but to put it through. It was very bitter for me to see the Republican Party, when I had put it back on the Abraham Lincoln basis, in three years turn over to a combination of big financiers and unscrupulous political bosses. What the future of the Progressive Party will be, nobody can say, but I am very confident that our principles in some shape or other will triumph. At present, however, I do not see how the party can triumph under me; but I have to continue to take a certain interest in it until a new man of sufficient power comes along."

A letter that he wrote to George D. Crocker, of Boston, on November 19, 1912, is interesting as showing a disposition to abandon the issue which he himself had misnamed the recall of judges:

". . . Now as to the name which has been

given by me to  
the doctrine. It was given by me in a number  
of arguments  
in which I was trying to show that what was  
needed was not  
to recall judges who gave wrong  
constitutional decisions,  
but to recall the decisions. I have myself  
regretted the con-  
tinuous use of the term, but it is difficult to get  
a short term  
to explain just what we want to do.

" There is another fundamental difficulty for  
which I am  
largely responsible. A name to me means very  
little and I  
perpetually have to remind myself that such is  
not the fact